

## REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 21, and 22 have been amended.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 25-27, and 30 have been cancelled without prejudice with respect to future filings.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-23, 28, 29, and 31-35 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 17, and 31 are currently independent form.

### **1. Objection to Claim 25**

The Examiner's objection to Claim 25 is rendered moot by the cancellation of Claim 25.

### **2. Objection to Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner's objections to Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph have been noted. Specifically, the Examiner indicates there is an uncertainty as to the number of acoustic signals referred to in Claim 1, which carries through to the dependent claims.

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Previously dependent claims 5, 9, and 17 which have been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 1, have further been amended to clarify the "acoustic signal" terminology, and accordingly, the objections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 with respect to the claims are believed to be overcome.

### **3. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 4, and 8 have been cancelled.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 22, and 23 have been amended as necessary to depend from one of the allowable independent claims 5, 9, or 17 discussed below, and

accordingly are seen as allowable over the cited references for the same reasons as the base claims.

**4. Rejection of Claims 12-16, 21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled.

Claims 12-16 and 21 have been amended as necessary to depend from one of the allowable independent claims 9 or 17, discussed below, and accordingly, are seen as allowable over the cited references for the same reasons as the base claims.

**5. Rejection of Claims 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The rejection of Claims 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,428 to *Casby et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,059 to *Kruger* is rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 27 and 30.

**6. Allowance of Claims 5, 9, and 17-20**

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 5, 9, and 17-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5, 9, and 17 have been amended to overcome the stated objections and to include all of the limitations of base claim 1 and the associated intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 5, 9, and 17, together with the various claims which depend there from, are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amendments to the claims have been made such that claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10-16, and 18-23 now depend either directly or indirectly from one of the allowable independent claims 5, 9, or 17, and as such, are each seen as allowable for the same reasons.

**7. Allowed Claims**


The Examiner has indicated that Claims 28, 28, and 31-35 are in condition for allowance.

**8. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, the allowance of all remaining claims is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to pass the application to issue and feels that an interview or Examiner's Amendment would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview or to discuss an Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Books, Reg. No. 40,918  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.  
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200  
St. Louis, Missouri 63131  
Tel: (314) 238-2400  
Fax: (314) 238-2401  
[mbooks@patpro.com](mailto:mbooks@patpro.com)